UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,526	02/07/2006	' Gottlieb Benz	FELD-137XX	9274
207 7590 02/16/2007 WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE			EXAMINER	
			LOW, LINDSAY M	
BOSTON, MA 02109		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3721	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTUS	02/16/2007	DAD	ED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/567,526	BENZ, GOTTLIEB			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lindsay M. Low	3721			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. (C) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Fe	ebruary 2006.				
2a)□		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.	· .				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are withdrawn					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)🖂	Claim(s) 5-11 is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[汉]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er				
,—	The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 February 2006</u> is/are	•	ed to by the Examiner.			
رد.	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
,	•					
_	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document					
	2. Certified copies of the priority document					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National Stage			
+ 0	application from the International Bureau					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
		•				
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
)					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/7/2006 and 1/22/07</u> .	6) Other:				
	1.00					

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of a packing unit for transferring tubes in the reply filed on December 14th, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that examination of all the claims is not seen as imposing an undue burden on the examiner. This is not found persuasive because the claims are clearly directed to two different inventive concepts (i.e. a packaging unit and a method for packaging tubes). The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made final.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Information Disclosure Statement

- 3. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) submitted on 2/7/2006 and 1/22/2007 are acknowledged. The IDS meets the requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. Therefore, the references therein have been considered.
- 4. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but

Art Unit: 3721

must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

- 5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 33.
- 6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "V" has been used to designate both a direction (designated by an arrow) and the tube closures.
- 7. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filling date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3721

Specification

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the referrals to the claims to describe the invention on page 3 under "Brief Summary of the Invention" are improper and should be removed. In addition on page 9, the mandrels have been referred to with the number 21 when it should be 25. On page 10, the piston-cylinder units have been referred to with the number 30 when it should be either 22 or 29. On page 11 the ejection rods have been referred to with the number 25 when it should be 26.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 10. Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There are terms in the claims that are confusing and not generally recognized for its use. That is, the claims are replete with language that is not in Idiomatic English, rendering the claims difficult to understand. In addition, claim 5 recites the phrase, "fills the tubes from the grouping unit into a box." As it is best understood, the tubes are not filled during operation of the packing unit. They are only transferred from a conveyor into a box. Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, which is part of the non-elected

Art Unit: 3721

group of claims directed to a method, not a device. From hereafter it will be assumed that claim 6 depends on claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 12. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrelly (5,611,193) in view of Burcham et al (5,471,738).

Farrelly discloses the same invention including a packing unit with a mandrel support 47 that is a plate having mandrels that are attached to it (Fig. 1). The plate corresponds to a span of the box 15 as shown in Fig. 3. The mandrel support 47 picks up articles 11 using the mechanical gripping arrangement (col. 1 lines 17-18) with the mandrels, and then deposits the articles 11 into a box 15.

Farrelly fails to disclose the mandrel support plate having two rows of mandrels. However the examiner takes Official Notice of it being well known to add numerous rows of mandrels to a transfer device for the purpose of expediting the process of transferring articles from one location to another.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Farrelly's transfer plate 47 with another row of

Art Unit: 3721

mandrels for the purpose of expediting the process of transferring the articles 11 from the conveyor to the container 15.

Farrelly fails to disclose the mandrels being made of plastic. However the examiner takes Official Notice of the well-known use of plastic in industry for the purpose of lowering the cost of manufacture. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use plastic to form Farrelly's mandrels for the purpose of lowering the cost of manufacture.

Farrelly fails to disclose the mandrels having longitudinal bores with the free end having a larger diameter than the diameter of the plane end and for which the bores can receive screws. However the examiner takes Official Notice of it being well known to provide a way to easily access parts for the purpose of facilitating disassembly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a way to access the screws that attach the mandrels to the plate for the purpose of facilitating disassembly of the mandrels, such as through bores made to receive screws.

Farrelly also fails to disclose a specific pull-off element for releasing the articles 11 from the mandrels. However, Burcham teaches a device for transferring cylindrical articles where the mandrels 16 have a pull-off element with teeth for the purpose of releasing the articles 10 from the mandrels when being deposited into containers 20 (col. 4 lines 20-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a pull-off element as taught by Burcham for the purpose of releasing articles from the mandrels of Farrelly's invention so that they can be deposited into a box.

Art Unit: 3721

Farrelly also fails to disclose the mandrels having rectangular cross sections with free ends that converge conically into a blunt tip. However, Burcham teaches mandrels 18 that are in the shape of pins (Figs. 3 and 4) and have rectangular cross-sections (Fig. 6) and which converge conically (Figs. 3 and 4) into a blunt tip. The longitudinal edges are rounded. The mandrels are shaped in this way for the purpose of facilitating the insertion of the mandrels into the articles 10 and for successfully gripping the articles for transportation (col. 3 lines 47-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to shape Farrelly's mandrels into pins rounded edges with rectangular cross-sections and which converge conically into a blunt tip as taught by Burcham for the purpose of facilitating the insertion of the mandrels into the articles and for successfully gripping the articles for transportation.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 10 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Linner (224), Mielke, Gargrave, Engleson, Tedeschi,

Art Unit: 3721

Creek, Walz, Inata, Conaway, Linner (416), Linner, Crabb, Carson, Nishimura, Viitanen, Liedtke, and Goetzelmann are cited to show related inventions.

- 15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lindsay M. Low whose telephone number is 571-272-1196. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30 to 5:00.
- 16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LIVIL 1/25/2007

> Rinaldi I. Rada Supervisery Patent Examiner Group 3700